

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 20, 2007. Claims 1-33 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33. The present response amends claims 1-13, 23, and 33 and adds new claims 35-42. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In addition, independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 33 are amended to state "*wherein when the event is not a matched event the observer is not notified.*" This limitation ensures that the condition of whether an event is a matched event need be evaluated.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

In the Office Action mailed March 20, 2007, the Examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as lacking the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. the Examiner further states, claims 1, 4, 8-9 and 11-12 do not produce tangible results because the terms "operable to" do not require the step to be performed. Once the step is not performed, there is no concrete, useful and tangible result.

As currently amended, the term "operable to" has been removed from claims 1, 4, 8-9 and 11-12. In addition, both independent claims 1 and 33 are specified as "*[a] computer-implemented system*" supported by Paragraph [0021 – 0023]. A computer-implemented system, which is different from a software process or program *per se*, is a patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn. For the same reason, claims 2- 12, which are dependent claims based on independent claim 1, should also be allowed.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (Publication No. 2004/0167864) in view of Kozlov (Publication No. 2003/0221168 A1), and further in view of Beauchamp, *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,621,505 B1).

Kozlov

In the Office Action mailed on March 20, 2007, Examiner cited Kozlov that “teaches keeping in memory only a subset of the stream of events at any time as to a check is made to determine whether child element of the current element can be removed from memory” in the process of parsing and formatting a document encoded using a markup language in a memory-constrained environment.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the process in Kozlov builds a partial document tree in memory ([0044] in Kozlov), which includes the current node and remaining previously formatted nodes upon which formatting of said current node is dependent ([0013] in Kozlov). In contrast, the present invention only keeps one event or a subset of the stream of events in memory at anytime. In another word, the partial document tree in Kozlov will always include particularly the root node of the document, whereas a subset of the stream of events in present invention can be any portion of the document not containing the root node. In addition, it is quite likely that, in Kozlov, the entire document stays in memory and none of the elements is removed if certain conditions or formatting rules (as described in [0046]-[0048]) are not met.

More specifically, the Applicant respectfully submits that Kozlov does not teach “accepting a first event from the stream of events and keeping in memory only said first event of the stream of events at one time,” as in currently amended independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 33, since the partial document tree in Kozlov will always include the root node whereas said one

event in the stream of events in present invention can be any node or portion of XML document not containing root node.

In addition, the Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

Beauchamp

In the same Office Action and Office Action mailed 3/17/06, Examiner cited Beauchamp that teaches “notifying an observer if the event is a match.” However, the event in the present invention represents a portion of the document as the document is being parsed, whereas the event referred in Beauchamp is generally a change in user interface (col. 21, lines 27-29). In addition, the present invention is a data processing method, whereas Beauchamp discloses a data presentation method that concerns more about how to response to user interaction. Hence, the present invention is apparently different from Beauchamp.

Therefore, Wang in view of Kozlov and further in view of Beauchamp cannot render the present invention in independent claims 1, 13, 23, and 33 obvious. Since claims 2-12 depend on claim 1, claims 14-22 depend on claim 13, claims 24-32 depend on claim 23, Wang in view of Kozlov and further in view of Beauchamp cannot render claims 1-33 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn. For the same reason, claims 35-36 depend on claim 1, claims 37-38 depend on claim 13, claims 39-40 depend on claim 23, and claims 41-42 depend on claim 33, Applicant respectfully requests that the newly added claims 35-42 be allowed.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The

Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 11, 2007

By: _____ /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910